

208404,208405,208406

RECORD NO.

128857

SHAUGHNESSEY NO

REVIEW NO.

EEB REVIEW

DATE: IN 12-3-87 OUT 12-31-87

FILE OR REG. NO. 707-ERE 707-ERN 707-ERR

PETITION OR EXP. NO. \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF SUBMISSION 11-12-87

DATE RECEIVED BY HED 12-1-87

RD REQUESTED COMPLETION DATE 12-31-87

EEB ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE 12-31-87

RD ACTION CODE/TYPE OF REVIEW 111

TYPE PRODUCT(S) Fungicide

DATA ACCESSION NO(S) 404092

PRODUCT MANAGER, NO. L. Rossi (21)

PRODUCT NAME(S) Rally (Myclobutanil, Systhane, RH-3866)

COMPANY NAME Rohm and Haas Company

SUBMISSION PURPOSE Registrant Response to Previous Review  
of Early Life-Stage Study with Fathead  
Minnow

SHAUGHNESSEY NO.

CHEMICAL

% A.I.

_____	<u>Myclobutanil</u>	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

*Review sent to registrant on 1/6/88*



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF  
PESTICIDES AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

MEMORANDUM

December 28, 1987

SUBJECT: Registrant Response to Previous EEB Review of Early Life-Stage with Fathead Minnow, Record Nos: 208404, 208405, 208406

FROM: *Daniel Rieder 12-28-87*  
Daniel Rieder, Wildlife Biologist  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division

THRU: *for Allen W. Vaughan 12-28-87*  
Norman J. Cook, Head, Section 2  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division

THRU: *Henry Craven 12-28-87*  
Henry T. Craven, Acting Chief  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division TS-769C

TO: Lois Rossi PM(21)  
Insecticide/Fungicide Branch  
Registration Division TS-767C

The registrant, Rohm and Haas Company has submitted additional information on the fish early life stage test previously reviewed by EEB, see review dated July 31, 1987. In that review, EEB indicated that additional information was necessary before the test evaluation could be completed. The test was categorized as supplemental because of the missing information. All but one of the noted deficiencies have been adequately addressed, see attached excerpt from the submission in which ABC Laboratories satisfactorily addresses each protocol question. The deficiency which the registrant failed to address was the submission of all required raw data. In the final response (Page 8 of 72, attached excerpt) it indicates that raw mortality data are provided on pages 38 to 45. In the copies of raw data provided with the submission, the registrant provided pages 38, 39, and 45, omitting pages 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44. The EEB notes that other raw data previously required have been provided including:

1. number of embryos hatched;
2. time to hatch; and
3. measurement of length and weight.

#### Conclusion

When the required mortality data for days 11 through 26 of the study have been provided, EEB will complete its reevaluation of the study.